

## Parent Involvement 2002-2003 APR

Is the provision of a free appropriate public education to children with disabilities facilitated through parent involvement in special education services?

Idaho will include stakeholders in the decision-making process at all levels\* (individual, building, district and state) to ensure improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Indicator 1: Percentage of parents/guardians who report attending their child's last IEP meeting.**

Target: 90% of parents report attending their child's last IEP meeting.

Progress: The target was met. Progress is attributed to feedback districts received both as a result of the monitoring process and from the findings in child count verification.

**Indicator 2: Percentage of parents/guardians who report being actively or very actively involved in the eligibility decision for their child.**

Target: 80% of parents report participation in the eligibility decision.

Progress: The target was met. Progress is attributed to feedback districts received during the monitoring process.

5. Future Activities	6. Projected Timelines	7. Projected Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to conduct annual parent involvement surveys in conjunction with the continuous improvement monitoring process.</li> </ul>	Begin with March 2004 self-assessment group and continuing annually.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SDE Monitoring Personnel</li> <li>Part VI-B funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to track the number of complaints and hearings filed by parents and the total number of issues.</li> </ul>	Annually for each school year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispute Resolution Coordinator</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to offer training (or support Idaho Parents Unlimited in offering training) to increase parent awareness of their involvement in the special education process.</li> <li>Continue to collaborate with Idaho Parents Unlimited in parent training efforts regarding the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEP participation</li> <li>Eligibility decision making</li> <li>Communication/working relationships to reduce disputes</li> </ul> </li> <li>Provide an annual parent training conference through collaboration between SDE and Idaho Parents Unlimited.</li> </ul>	June 2004 Training Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SDE staff</li> <li>Regional Consultants</li> <li>Part VI-B and SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on increasing parent involvement by parents of Hispanic and American Indian students with disabilities by the following means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit minority parents to fill vacancies on the Special Education Advisory Panel.</li> <li>In partnership with Idaho Parent Teachers Association, Idaho Parents Unlimited, American Indian Families Together Parent Center, and the Hispanic Community Parent Resource Center, provide information and joint training on (a) response to intervention and partner's role on school intervention teams, (b) research-based reading and math and parent involvement to support instruction and (c) parents' role in fostering self-determination in support of transition to post-school success.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD/SIG Coordinator</li> <li>Part VI-B and SIG funding</li> </ul>

## **Recruitment and Retention of Personnel in Special Education**

### **2002-2003 APR**

Are there sufficient numbers of administrators, teachers, related services providers, paraprofessionals, and other providers to meet the identified educational needs of all children with disabilities in the State?

Personnel in Idaho are trained to ensure that all students with disabilities at all age levels receive appropriate services in the least restrictive environments

#### **Indicator 1: Percentage of fully certified special education personnel.**

Target: >90% fully certified special education personnel.

Progress: The target was met. 90% of special education personnel were fully certified. Progress is attributed to the following:

- Idaho enacted a rule in 2000 that requires personnel on emergency certification to complete a program toward certification within three years.
- This issue has been a focus during the monitoring process.

#### **Indicator 2: Retention rate for special education teachers.**

Target: >90% retention rate for special education teachers.

Progress: The target was met. Retention of special education staff increased from 89.9% to 92.0%. Progress may be attributed to the following:

- The downturn of the economy and lack of other job opportunities.
- Districts initiated creative measures to recognize the workload special education teachers carry and to help them feel supported and valued.

#### **Indicator 3: Caseload size of special education teachers.**

Target: Caseload size for special education teachers of <25.

Slippage: The target was not met. Caseload size for special education teachers increased from 25 to 26 students per teacher. Due to a negative economic climate the legislature reduced funding resulting in many districts eliminating positions.

#### **Indicator 4: Number of special education graduates from Idaho colleges and universities.**

Target: >60 special education graduates from Idaho colleges and universities.

Slippage: The target was not met. Significantly fewer 2003 Idaho graduates took a degree in special education. Slippage has occurred despite the following:

- Scholarships funded by the State Improvement Grant have been awarded to 200 students over the past three years to encourage the pursuit of a degree in special education.

#### **Indicator 5: Number of qualified applicants for special education vacancies.**

Target: >2.0 applicants for special education positions.

Progress: During the past year there was a small increase in the average number of qualified applicants for special education teacher vacancies from 1.6 to 2.2.

- In January 2003 Idaho initiated an education employment web board for posting vacancies; this may have contributed to the improvement.

5. Future Activities	6. Projected Timelines	7. Projected Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborate with Idaho Association of School Administrators to propose a rule regarding case load sizes.</li> </ul>	2004-2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop an equitable funding formula that supports the districts with the lowest resources to lower caseloads.</li> </ul>	2004-2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>State Appropriations</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use scholarships to encourage paraprofessionals to gain an Associate of Applied Science degree.</li> </ul>	2004-2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide funding in support of the alignment of courses and credit between all two-year and four-year higher education programs to encourage paraprofessionals to continue in teacher preparation programs.</li> </ul>	2003-2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand the Idaho Education Employment Website function to include a searchable database of potential candidates to fill vacancies.</li> </ul>	2003-2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For partner districts experiencing a high rate of personnel on emergency certification and a low retention rate, do the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a database employee search tool</li> <li>Train and provide new special education teacher coaches</li> <li>Train administrators on research-based methods for the retention of personnel</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2004-2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce paperwork by adopting a statewide web-based tool for developing IEPs.</li> </ul>	2004-2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Train and provide coaches to targeted districts to equip special education personnel in effective instruction in reading and math.</li> </ul>	2004-2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborate with a partnership of districts, higher education, and NWREL to apply for a transition to teaching grant.</li> </ul>	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG Funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate a meeting between higher education, district personnel and the SDE to clarify priorities in the preparation of personnel to address the needs of students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSPD Coordinator</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>

## Secondary Transition

### 2002-2003 APR

Is the percentage of youth with disabilities participating in post-school activities (e.g., employment, education, etc.) comparable to that of non-disabled youth?

Improve post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities to reflect participation in post-school activities, including post-secondary education and employment

Target: A new indicator has just been established. A target has been set for the next reporting period.

Indicator 1: Percentage of youth with disabilities attending post-secondary programs (4-year, 2-year and vocational-technical) compared to all high school graduates.

Progress: Low and unfavorable trend Idaho has a number of youth that participate in religious missions following high school graduation delaying entry into post-secondary education by two years. An item has been added to the surveys to address this. Data from the three-year follow-up survey will be analyzed, as it is available, to see if participation in religious missions is affecting the one-year follow-up data. The baseline for future reporting will be 20%.

**Indicator 2: Percentage of youth with disabilities working one year after graduation compared to all youth 16 to 21 years of age.**

Target: This is a new indicator and baseline has just been established. A target has been set for the next reporting period.

Progress: Low and unfavorable trend. The decrease in the percentage of students reporting employment since graduation is concerning. One contributing factor is most likely the large number of lay-offs across the state in telecommunications and technology industries that took place in 2002 and 2003. These lay-offs forced workers from higher paying jobs to take service and entry-level jobs that are traditionally taken by youth. This is reflected in a lower rate of employment for all youth in Idaho ages 16 to 21 years. The baseline for future reporting will be 64%.

**Indicator 3: Percentage of youth with disabilities reporting average or above average involvement in their IEP development, including transition planning.**

Target: This indicator was reported last year for the first time. A baseline of 92% has been established. No target was set at that time. A target has been set for the next reporting period.

Progress: Flat but favorable trend. The student data collected through the Post School Outcome Survey indicated a high level of student involvement for both the 2002 Class (92%) and the 2003 Class (92%). The baseline for future reporting will be 92%.

Indicator 4: Percentage of youth with disabilities reporting that their high school connected them to a job, college or community agency such as Vocational Rehabilitation.

Target: This is a new indicator and baseline has just been established. A target has been set for the next reporting period.

Progress: Flat trend. The baseline for future reporting will be 75%.

Future Activities	6. Projected Timelines	6. Projected Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to develop and support a Secondary Transition Learning Community to provide on-line and traditional training formats.</li> </ul>	Summer 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offer mini-workshops on topics related to the key indicators for secondary transition twice a year in eight locations around the state.</li> <li>Provide training and follow-up to teachers and parents regarding student-led IEP process and other planning methods that increase student participation.</li> </ul>	Fall 2004  Spring 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Transition Leadership cadre, including higher education faculty to address the statewide training needs in preservice and inservice for professional, paraprofessional and parent training.</li> </ul>	Summer 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary Transition Specialist</li> <li>Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>

Future Activities	6. Projected Timelines	6. Projected Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a model for development of self-determination skills for youth that includes presentations and mentoring provided by adults with disabilities.</li> </ul>	Ongoing  Model finalized Summer 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Independent Living Council: Secondary Transition Team</li> <li>Secondary Transition Specialist</li> <li>SIG funding</li> <li>Exceeding Expectations Grant (Colorado State University) funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule two meetings annually to support an organization of post-secondary disability service personnel.</li> </ul>	Summer 2004  Winter 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary Transition Specialist</li> <li>Exceeding Expectations Grant (Colorado State University) funding</li> <li>SIG funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate all Idaho key indicators for secondary transition and their measures into the LEA self-evaluation and planning for Idaho's CIMP process.</li> </ul>	August 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary Transition Specialist</li> <li>Monitoring Coordinator</li> <li>SDE Regional Consultants</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize the state interagency agreement among agencies, including roles and responsibilities of each agency in the IEP and transition planning and the transition process.</li> <li>Develop a template for protocols to be used at the district level to assist in planning and coordinating secondary transition services for individual youth.</li> </ul>	Summer 2004  Summer 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition.</li> </ul>

## Student Outcomes

2002-2003 APR

Are high school graduation rates and dropout rates for children with disabilities comparable to graduation rates and dropout rates for non-disabled children?

**Indicator 1: Dropout rate.**

Target: 5.5% dropout rate.

**Indicator 2: Graduation rate.**

Target: 73.8% graduation rate.

Progress: Both the graduation and dropout targets were exceeded. The dropout rate met and exceeded the general education rate. This success is attributed to:

- Interventions employed by districts as part of the monitoring process.
- Public data reporting increased LEA motivation to accurately report data.

Do performance results for children with disabilities on large-scale assessments improve at a rate that decreases any gap between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers?

**Indicator 1: Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) participation for students with disabilities.**

Target: 95% participation for all grades.

Progress: Target exceeded. The following factors influenced progress:

- NCLB consequences motivated general educators to take an active role in ensuring that all students participated.
- Public reporting of special education participation rates.
- Monitoring activities targeted test participation for improvement in many districts.
- Training on accommodations.
- 

**Indicator 2: ISAT performance at proficient or advanced level**

Target: Establish baseline.

Progress: Target met. Baseline established.

5. Future Activities	6. Projected Timelines	7. Projected Resources
• Continue working with the Math and Science Partnership to identify effective math interventions.	September 2004	• Bureau Chief
• Provide math and science intervention training statewide for special education teachers.	April 2005	• Regional Consultants • Part VI-B funds
• Collaborate at the State level with the Idaho Reading Initiative and Reading First to identify effective reading interventions.	September 2004	• Bureau Chief • Early Intervention Specialist
• Provide core reading interventions training statewide for special education teachers.	April 2005	• Regional Consultants • Early Intervention Specialist • Part VI-B funds
• Target districts with low test performance for focus monitoring and interventions.	2004-2005	• Quality Assurance Coordinator